SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

10th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. X, No. 17 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | October 15, 1980

Consulting Abuses Draw Congressional Fire

Following critical press exposure and two harsh reports from the General Accounting Office, the cozy relationship between federal agencies and many of their contracted-for consulting services has received further knocks from Congress in recent weeks.

The brains-for-hire system has not been pushed into any substantial changes as a result of these barrages, but some government careers have been bruised, a bit of embarrassment is evident in some quarters, and Congress has helped itself to yet another opportunity for expressing indignation. To make its point, the Senate actually trimmed away some funds intended for consulting services, but consulting being one of the more financially opaque operations in federal affairs, the cuts were immediately enmeshed in controversy over whether they're actually large or small.

Keeping the pot stirring have been various Congressional committees that have alighted gleefully on claimed evidence of bureaucratic mismanagement. In response, the Senate last month voted to support a cut of $14 million in the budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and $12 million in the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency for the fiscal year 1981. The Senate argued that these figures represented 15 percent of the budgets for each agency allocated for consultancy contracts. Both agencies protested strongly, however, that the Senate has based its calculations on misleading figures from the Department of Commerce's classification of federal activities; that in reality their consultancy budgets, according to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions, is only $4.3 and $13 million, respectively, with the rest of the money being spent on necessary technical support services. They argued that if the cuts are not restored in conference with the House, they will inflict unnecessary damage on the effectiveness of each.

Mondale Makes a Pitch For the Science Vote—Page 4

The latest skirmishes are part of a long-running debate over how much of the demands placed by Congress on a federal agency should be carried out by the agency itself, and how much can legitimately be transferred to outside contractors. With an increasing workload, and strict personnel and salary ceilings imposed by OMB, the use of contractors to do more and more of the work of government has obvious attractions. But the inevitable price has been to blur the line between public and private responsibility and invite some questionable practices.

Several examples ripe for political exploitation were produced last month at hearings by the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, chaired by Representative Bob Eckhardt (D-Tex). Previous hearings by the subcommittee had examined the government's use of cost/benefit analysis in decision-making, and had revealed substantial differences of opinion about its effectiveness.

According to Eckhardt, the earlier hearings had led the subcommittee to the conclusion that "the most important fact to know about any cost-benefit analysis was who paid for it." This in turn raised the question of how federal agencies select outside contractors for carrying out studies of the costs and benefits of proposed regulations—and in particular the implications of employing for this task companies which were also engaged in carrying out similar work for companies

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

Edward Teller, little heard of on the Washington scene in recent years, may soon be making regular visits to the capital—but that's got nothing to do with the outcome of the presidential election. The nuclear physicist, now associated with the Hoover Institution, at Stanford, has been nominated for membership on the Advisory Council of the Office of Technology Assessment. It's rumored that Teller, 72, is an adviser to Ronald Reagan, but whatever his campaign role, it's not inner circle.

Associates of Philip Handler, retiring President of the National Academy of Sciences, say he's planning a return to Duke University—where he made his scientific reputation— upon leaving office next June 30. White House Science Adviser Frank Press will be the sole nominee for replacing Handler.

Less certain at this point is a replacement for the Academy's retiring Vice President, Saunders MacLane, of the University of Chicago. VP is a powerful post there, because along with it comes the chairmanship of the Report Review Committee, which decides whether Academy reports are fit to print.

...Serving the Regulators and Regulated

(Continued from page 1)

at which the regulations were targeted.

As Rep. Norman E. Lent (R-NY), a member of the subcommittee, put it: "Our hearings have revealed that time and time again, government agencies have awarded contracts to consulting firms which have prepared similar work projects for regulated industries. Since the interests of the regulator and the regulated so often lie in opposite directions, a prima facie case for conflict of interest exists."

Studies of a number of federal contracts by the General Accounting Office produced several examples of such apparent conflict of interest. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), for example, was found to have contracted research to a Boston consulting firm, Harbridge House, for use in formulating a report to Congress in January 1979. Even before the work for NHTSA was completed, however, the company was trying to persuade the Ford Motor Company to fund a similar study in connection with deliberations in Congress; it eventually succeeded in obtaining such a contract from General Motors.

According to Eckhardt, the study carried out for the Safety Administration contained "numerous analytical flaws, biased in favor of the auto industry," and NHTSA policy personnel had subsequently to spend a "substantial amount of energy" on refuting the study. "The GM study contained a very elemental error which biased the report in such a way that it reached the absurd conclusion that the current fuel economy standards are not cost effective," Eckhardt charged.

Part of the difficulty facing regulatory agencies is that, if they are operating in an area where expertise is scarce, it is difficult to avoid using consultants who do not have links with the industry being regulated, since industry is likely to be the principal source of consultancy work. The problem is compounded by a natural inclination to play safe by using consultants who have already successfully completed contracts for the agency, rather than spending extra time and money seeking competitive bids. This practice, too, was widely criticized with one GAO report, published last March, commenting on "extensive sole-source awards which precluded effective price competition."

Investigations by the Eckardt subcommittee of consultant contracts issued in connection with the development of regulation covering Underground Injection Control, required by the Safe Drinking Water Act" of 1974, found that 12 of the 13 contracts issued were not put out for competition; in the remaining case there was only one bidder, the company which had already carried out several of the other contracts. According to the subcommittee, much of the information compiled under the contracts seemed to duplicate earlier work done by the company for the agency, or could be easily obtained from state regulatory bodies. Total costs for the 13 con-

(Continued on page 3)

Congress OK's Big R&D Bills

With relatively little public notice, two big sci-tech bills made it through Congress on the eve of the homeward-bound, pre-election exodus.

The first to pass was Rep. Mike McCormack's (D-Wash.) magnetic-fusion bill, calling for a fast-paced program aimed at putting a demonstration fusion plant into operation around the year 2000. The bill calls for raising the $400-million-a-year fusion budget to an annual rate of $1 billion dollars within three years. The short-term "pork" aspect is in a provision for building a fusion-engineering center by 1990—a $1-billion item, site unspecified.

The other bill, the Technology Innovation Act, was initially sponsored by two retiring members, Senator Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill) and Rep. John W. Wydler (R-NY). It calls for spending $285 million over the next five years to promote industrial innovation in academic, non-profit, and government research organizations.

Both bills are authorizations. The funding stage comes next; given the topsy-turvy nature of politics and the economy at present, the outcome in money is uncertain.

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1980

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Contributing Correspondents
Anne Roark, Clive Cookson (Washington); Michael Kenward (London); Francois Seguier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $118.50 (two years, $198.50); individuals, $48.50 (two years, $82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

...EPA Withdraws $285,000 Consulting Job

(Continued from page 2)

sultancy contracts was almost $1.4 million—more than enough, the subcommittee suggested, to hire a team of engineers, economists, and other specialists.

"While EPA apparently did not violate any law in its use of these consultants, the case does appear to suggest substantial mismanagement and the consulting practices may have resulted in undue delay in the issuance of the UIC regulations and a waste of taxpayers' monies," suggested Eckardt.

Finally there was the case of Environment Research and Technology, Inc. (ERT) of Massachusetts, one of the nation's largest environmental analysis firms, which has been under contract to the Department of Energy to carry out studies to support DOE's position on clean-air legislation, a contract for which the company has already been paid almost $50,000. Prior to bidding for the DOE contract, the company had carried out several studies for the American Paper Institute aimed at weakening the provisions of the Clean Air Act as it was being debated by Congress in 1977.

At one point, a cost-benefit study which purported to show the crippling effect that the Act would have on the Maine pulp and paper industry was prepared for delivery at a joint meeting held with local trade unions and industry representatives by Edward Muskie (D-Maine), who was then chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Environmental Pollution, the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Clean Air Amendments. "The study on Maine was blatantly political," charged Subcommittee staff member David Nelson, who had carried out a review of ERT's various contracts. "ERT participated in a blatant political effort to influence Senator Muskie by presenting a report without any advance notice before a group of important Muskie constituents." On returning to Washington and checking with EPA officials, according to Nelson, the agency sharply disagreed with many of the company's findings and conclusions.

Federal agencies reacted in different ways to the charges leveled by the Oversight Subcommittee, although most claimed that they were the result of past practices which had since been corrected. In the ERT case, for example, the Department of Energy admitted that it had not examined the contractor's specific links with industry as closely as it might have done for possible conflict of interest. ERT was never asked for details of potential conflicts, even when renewing its contract in September 1977, four months after a temporary regulation requiring such notification had gone into effect.

In the case of the EPA, too, agency officials told the subcommittee that procedures to avoid conflicts of interest had recently been tightened up. According to EPA Deputy Administrator Barbara Blum, EPA instituted a policy in early 1978 that requires all bidders and contractors to report any existing and potential conflicts of interest. In addition, Blum says she is now proposing that the agency ask bidders for contracts to list situations where they have taken a point of view on the subject within the preceding three years. And chairpersons of technical evaluation panels will be asked to certify that no known conflicts of interest are involved in the proposals they have evaluated.

Blum said that "as a regulatory agency, EPA occupies a special position of trust and must not relax its vigilance on these issues. This is especially true in the case of conflict of interest, which strikes at the heart of EPA's credibility as the guarantor of the public's interest in a clean, safe environment." A few days later, the agency announced, following disclosures in the *Washington Star,* that it was withdrawing the offer of a $285,000 consultancy contract which had been made to a research worker at the California Institute of Technology for a study on the health effects of radon gas. Investigations within the agency revealed the Caltech contract to be one of several that had been offered on a non-competitive basis to various contractors by David Rosebaum, a former employee of the Mitre Corporation who is currently head of the EPA's Office of Radiation Program. The agency's inspector-general reported that she had found "serious and troublesome" problems in the contract procedures in the radiation office. Her report showed that non-compatitive contracts offered by the office had frequently been justified on the grounds that the recipient was the only company

(Continued on page 4)

In Print

Controlling Nitrous Oxides: A Research Summary, outlines R&D on what the Environmental Protection Agency says "could be one of the most troublesome air pollutants of the 1980s"; 23 pages, no charge, Publication EPA-600/8-80-004, available from: USEPA, Center for Environmental Research Information, 26 West St. Clair Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45268; tel., (513) 684-7562.

A Memorandum on the Function of University Research in the Netherlands, its Funding and Accountability, English version of "The Dutch Government's first policy document devoted entirely to university research..."; 89 pages, no charge, available from: Ministry of Education and Science, Nieuwe Uitleg 1, The Hague, Netherlands.

We've Been Good to Science, Mondale Says

Pork-barrel gambits toward the research community are relatively rare in presidential campaigns, simply because scientists are too few and dispersed to merit precious campaign time. Nonetheless, the Carter Administration, which can boast a moderately good record in support of academic science, is not missing any vote-catching opportunities; accordingly, Vice President Walter Mondale was sent September 25 to MIT, where he delivered an address that included the following in the prepared text:

I believe universities need not more direction from Washington, but more support from Washington. If a research team is first rate, they don't need the paperwork. And if it is a shoddy research project, all the paperwork in the world won't help. Surely government and universities must begin working their way toward a new social contract between them, providing reasonable standards of accountability on the one hand, and scrupulously guaranteeing academic freedom on the other.

I am proud that the long slide in Federal support for basic research has ended. President Carter has increased funding for basic research each year in office. It has risen by $1.6 billion and in the next two years we have budgeted for 3% real growth in basic research funds. For the first time in history, a President has asked for and received over $1 billion for the National Science Foundation.

Last month President Carter outlined a new program to revitalize American industry. $600 million of that effort has been earmarked for research and technology development. More needs to be done, but this significant first step symbolizes the crucial nature of the objective.

In the President's economic message, the commitment to research was made clear; the initial amount was specified; but we deferred the specifics of the program until we could consult with you, and with others at centers of excellence across the country.

If you have ideas for revitalizing our great research universities, and I suspect you do, I invite you to corres-

(Continued on page 5)

Claims vs. the Record

Allowing for campaign license, how does this relatively rare item of stumping for the science vote rate in terms of accuracy? The answer is that several of Mondale's important points regarding Administation performance on research-related matters are true but incomplete. Specifically:

- Paperwork: The President could cut the academic paperwork burden with a simple edict from the Office of Management and Budget, but chooses not to for several reasons: Congress would balk at too low a level of accountability, and OMB just doesn't trust those academics sufficiently to rely on an honor system.
- Money for science: Carter has indeed raised support, but the process began under Gerald Ford. NSF's first billion-dollar budget occurred in this Administration, but was more or less in line with the Foundation's steady growth over the years.
- The $600 million that Carter has announced for R&D is simply a restoration of part of the money that was sliced out of the January budget in the anti-inflation revisions announced in March (SGR Vol. X, Nos. 15-16).

CONSULTING *Continued from page 3*

capable of carrying out the work, although in several cases—including the Caltech contract—this did not turn out to be the case.

Meanwhile OMB is still doing what it can to get its act together in a way acceptable to Congress. The agency has already told the GAO that it intends to issue Government-wide regulations on organizational conflicts of interest in 1981, and it voluntarily proposed to reduce the amount of funds for individual agencies to spend on consulting services by 15 percent in the 1981 fiscal year. But there still remains a semantic gulf. OMB calculates that total federal expenditure for consultants' services in 1979 was $278 million and has based its 15 percent recommended cut in 1981 on that figure. The GAO, however, taking a wider definition as used by the Department of Commerce, concluded that "actual expenditures could approximate $2 billion." Hence we now find NASA being asked to cut $14 million out of a budget item which, according to the agency, only adds up to a total of $4.3 million. During last month's debate, Senator Harrison Schmitt (R-NM) failed to convince the Senate to pass an amendment to the appropriations bill which would have reduced the cut to 15 percent of the $4.3 million—although this may well be the agreement that is reached in conference.

Statement of ownership

Statement of ownership, management, and circulation of *Science & Government Report*, published 21 times per year at 3736 Kanawha St. Nw., Washington, DC 20015; publisher and editor, Daniel S. Greenberg (same address); stockholders holding or owning one per cent or more of stock, Daniel S. Greenberg (same address). Extent and nature of circulation: average number of copies each issue during preceeding 12 months/actual number of copies of a single issue published nearest to filing date (October 15, 1980): total number of copies printed, 1800/1800; paid circulation through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales, 0/0; mail subscriptions, 1088/1160; free distribution by mail, carrier, or other means, 29/31, copies not distributed, 683/609, total, 1800/1800.

...VP Pledges Expanded Aid for Research

(Continued from page 4)

pond with me. In that same spirit, I invited the presidents of many of our greatest institutions, including [MIT President] Dr. [Paul] Gray, to begin designing the ways in which that initial $600 million should be used in a meeting I hosted at the White House last week. That meeting, and this one, and others will help us assemble a package we will send to the Congress very early in the next year. We want to lay the groundwork for a long-term national commitment to our research centers. And this morning I want to report briefly to you the consensus of our meeting at the White House.

Three problems stand out as most critical. First, people: students, faculty, research and technical staff, support personnel. I have heard it said that if we do not act, we will be in danger of losing an entire generation of researchers in key fields. Of course we need first-rate people going into applied work and the private sector. But if the universities lose their critical mass of researchers, both the campus and industry will be diminished. It is increasingly clear that, as the number of faculty openings has dwindled, as fellowships have declined in value and even disappeared, career patterns have tilted too consistently away from the academy....

The second critical need is tools: instruments, equipment, facilities, laboratories, libraries. One university researcher who recently toured a number of private-sector laboratories commented, "The Ivory Towers are now in industry." University research equipment is twice as old as industry's equipment. Students are learning and training on instruments which are already obsolete. And where we do have peerless facilities, such as our linear accelerators, they are often operating at far less than their effective full capacities.

Our research libraries need help, not only because it costs increasingly more to acquire and conserve and microfilm and computerize information, but also because the amount of knowledge is growing faster than our ability to store it usefully. Our laboratories need help, not only because the cost of equipment is rising, but also because leaps in science leave the instruments we do have behind. In 1960, a Nobel Prize was awarded for the development of the bubble chamber; today, that technique has largely been replaced by drift and wire chambers controlled by computers. It is time to make our equipment catch up with our minds.

5 to Receive Lawrence Prize

Named to receive the 1980 Ernest Orlando Lawrence Award—$5000 plus a medal—for contributions to atomic energy:

Donald Barr, Los Alamos National Scientific Laboratory; B. Grant Logan, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Nicholas P. Samios and Benno Schoenborn, Brookhaven National Laboratory, and Charles D. Scott, Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The award, established in 1959 to honor the inventor of the cyclotron, is earmarked for scientists "who are early in their careers and have made recent meritorious contributions to the development, use, or control of atomic energy," according to an announcement from the Department of Energy.

New Research Setup at DOT

Transportation Secretary Neil Goldschmidt has announced that he's setting up an office of Transportation Research and Technology to oversee the planning and management of all DOT research and development.

The new function, to be located in the Secretary's office, will be headed by a special advisor, still to be announced. Goldschmidt also announced that he's going to ask Congress to elevate to the presidential-appointee level the present post of head of the Research and Special Programs Administration, subject to Senate confirmation. A DOT announcement says Goldschmidt wants that Administration to "become the focus of basic research in the Department."

DOT encompasses the Coast Guard, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Federal Highway Administration, as well as several other organizations. At present each component goes its own way in research management and priorities.

NAS to Study Dallas Tapes

The National Academy of Sciences has agreed to study the much-disputed tape recordings made by the Dallas Police Department around the time of the assassination of President Kennedy. The analysis, financed with a grant of $23,360 from the National Science Foundation, is at the request of the Department of Justice.

According to an NSF announcement, the Academy will organize an ad hoc committee that will hold a three-day workshop to review methodology of a study performed for the House Select Committee on Assassinations. The study is supposed to lead to a report that will be delivered to the House Speaker and the Justice Department by the end of next January. If the initial study warrants it, NSF says, a longer workshop will be held next summer.

AEC Hid Fallout Hazards, House Study Says

The following is from "The Forgotten Guinea Pigs: A Report on Health Effects of Low-Level Radiation Sustained as a Result of the Nuclear Weapons Testing Program Conducted by the United States Government." The report was produced by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Copies are available without charge from the Subcommittee (U.S. House of Representatives, Room 2323 Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC 20515).

●

As early as 1953, the government was aware of the potential health hazards posed to humans by the internalization of radionuclides absorbed through the food chain system. Yet, the government failed to take measurements of milk contamination by radioisotopes, upon which to establish internal safety standards, until 1957. Moreover, the government refused to alter the levels subsequently set for internal radiation exposure even after a 1963 scientific report concluded that the government's original assessment of the hazard was substantially underestimated.

Essentially, these radiation exposure levels were based upon rates that factored in what were considered to be countervailing influences such as shielding. It later became clear that these levels, upon which the early radiological program set both external and internal safety standards, were not reflective of the actual measurements taken by the government's monitors of radiation doses or the actual health hazards posed by the radioactive fallout to specific populations. Nonetheless, the standards were not changed.

In addition, these levels failed to consider potential "hot-spots" of radioactive fallout owing to the limited number of sporadically-placed government monitors. Disregarding personal reports of radiation-related illnesses, which demonstrated potentially higher. . . levels than those actually measured by the government's monitors, the government persistently discounted the possibility of higher radiation doses. Still further, the government publicly espoused the safeness of the atmospheric nuclear testing program as the government also refrained from advertising the health hazards associated with exposure to radioactive fallout.

Even as evidence began accumulating on the necessity for altering the permissible standards for internal radiation exposure, resistance was met within the Atomic Energy Commission. In testimony before the Subcommittee, Dr. Harold Knapp detailed his discovery in 1963 that the original estimates of the internal hazard posed by radioactive fallout were understated drastically by the government:

". . . for 11 years we had missed by a factor of 100 to 1,000, perhaps, the doses to the thyroid of infants and young children that drank milk from cows that were grazing downwind in the fallout areas down around the Nevada Test Site."

Dr. Knapp testified that the AEC's immediate reaction to his discovery was "to find. . .why [his] conclusions might not be true." Still further, he asserted, "the Division of Operational Safety dragged its feet. . .to prevent the report from being published."

Referencing a memorandum written by Nathan H. Woodruff (then-Director, Division of Operational Safety, AEC), Dr. Knapp charged that the government refused to change the internal radiation standards owing to the concern that past judgments and evaluations made by the AEC then would be called into question. In a pertinent part of the memo, Nathan Woodruff advised A.R. Luedecke (then-General Manager, Division of Operational Safety, AEC) as follows:

"We do not recommend any new radiation protection guides for nuclear weapons testing at this time. The present guides have, in general, been adequate to permit continuance of nuclear weapons testing and at the same time have been accepted by the public, principally because of an extensive public information program. *To change the guides would require a re-education program that could raise questions in the public mind as to the validity of the past guides.* Lastly, the world situation today is not the best climate in which to raise the issue. Therefore, we recommend the continuation of the present criteria." (Emphasis added.)

Commenting on the government's lack of candor with the American public, Utah Governor Scott Matheson testified that "an all-out public relations campaign was mounted by the Atomic Energy Commission to assure those who lived close to the test site that there [was] no danger." Peter A. Libassi (former General Counsel for the Department of Health, Educa-

(Continued on page 7)

NASA Chief Says He'll Quit

Robert A. Frosch has informed the White House that he's resigning as head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, effective at the end of the presidential term, January 20. Frosch, who's held the post since June 1977, will become President of the American Association of Engineering Societies, a federation of 39 engineering organizations, with over one million members.

...Report Charges Deliberate Deception

(Continued from page 6)

tion and Welfare) also discussed the issue before the Subcommittee. Mr. Libassi testified that, despite the urgings of then-HEW Secretary Gardner to the White House for full disclosure of information, "...the press releases which were finally issued did not contain the information and warnings and concerns and questions that were already emerging." Specifically with regard to the sheep, thyroid and leukemia studies, Mr. Libassi noted the supression of the data by the Federal Government from public dissemination:

"... the American people were not informed of the evidence that was gathered during the 1950's and 1960's of the uncertainty as to the health effects of radiation from these atmospheric nuclear tests. They were simply not informed of the uncertainties that we knew about at that time."

Conclusions

Based on the evidence presented, the Subcommittee concludes that:

(1) the government, despite having sufficient reason to know of the hazards associated with radiation exposure, failed to give adequate warning to the residents living downwind from the test site regarding the dangers posed by the radioactive fallout emitted during the atmospheric nuclear test operations;

(2) the radiation monitoring system established by the government during the atmospheric nuclear testing program was deficient in giving accurate estimates of radiation exposure necessary to provide adequate health protection to the downwind residents;

(3) the government falsely interpreted and reported radiation exposure rates so as to give an inaccurate estimate of the hazards posed to the downwind residents from the atmospheric radioactive fallout;

(4) the government knowingly disregarded evidence which questioned the accuracy of the government's measurements of radioactivity emitted from the test site as well as the adequacy of the then-employed radiological safety standards; and

(5) exposure to radioactive fallout emitted during the atmospheric nuclear test operations was, more likely than not, responsible for the serious adverse health effects suffered by the downwind residents.

Six Named to Science Board

The following presidential appointees were confirmed September 23 by the Senate for six-year memberships on the National Science Board, the 24-member policymaking body of the National Science Foundation:

Peter T. Flawn, President, University of Texas at Austin

Mary L. Good, Boyd Professor of Materials Science, Louisiana State University

Peter D. Lax, Professor, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University

Mary Jane Osborn, Professor of Microbiology, University of Connecticut Health Center

Stuart A. Rice, Frank P. Hixon Distinguished Service Professor of Chemistry, The James Franck Institute, University of Chicago

Donald B. Rice, Jr., President, The Rand Corporation

DOE Awards Minority Grants

Five predominantly black universities have been awarded research grants, totaling about $320,000, "to assess current energy needs of minorities and low-income groups."

The grants, from the Department of Energy's Office of Minority Economic Impact, went to: Atlanta University, Jackson State University, Kentucky State University, Prairie View (Texas) A&M University, and Virginia Union University.

New Arms-Control Group

The National Academy of Sciences has established a Committee on International Security and Arms Control to work on, among other things, "ways to limit further development of sophisticated weapons worldwide." An NAS announcement states that the committee aims to establish "an internship program to place career-level natural scientists and engineers with the various government agencies concerned with nuclear materials and to hold discussions with other international bodies that share the same concerns for human safety and survival."

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $118.50 ☐; two years, $198.50 ☐

Individual subscribers: one year, $48.50 ☐; two years, $82.50 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $19.50 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

NSF Study Details Academic R&D Funding

The National Science Foundation's latest printout on traffic between academe and the US Treasury shows that about 54 percent of all government funding for higher education goes to institutions in nine states: California, New York, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Maryland, plus the District of Columbia.

Titled "Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Selected Non-Profit Institutions," the 158-page report takes the numbers up to fiscal 1978, but though all the amounts have gone up since then, the relative allocations have remained roughly the same. The 1978 total was approximately $7.4 billion, with about half that amount going for research-related activities.

Among other findings are that, in terms of purchasing power, federal obligations to academe dropped by 1.7 percent from 1967-75, but then rose by 10.5 percent in 1975-78, and by 8 percent in 1977-78. Translated into political terms, the figures reflect the Johnson-Nixon slighting of academe, and the ensuing Ford-Carter efforts to repair the damage. Additional highlights:

- Universities that grant science, engineering, and health-related doctorates received 74 percent of all Federal support in 1978, up from 70 percent in 1970.
- The leading 100 institutions in 1978 received 57 percent of all Federal academic obligations, compared to 67 percent in 1971. NSF says "The decrease in the funding concentration reflects the wider distribution of nonscience support, which comprised nearly one-half of total Federal support in 1978."
- The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (now Health and Human Services) funded about one-half of all academic R&D support in 1978, and was the source of nearly one-third of the 1977-78 increase.
- In 1978, funding for the social sciences increased by 38 percent over the 1977 amount, while engineering support was up 34 percent.
- The leading 100 institutions in Federal R&D obligations accounted for about five-sixths of all R&D academic obligations—the same proportion as in 1971.
- The 10 top R&D funding recipients among the 305 independent non-profit organizations receiving federal contracts were: Draper Laboratories, Rand Corp., SRI International, Battelle Memorial Institute, ITT Research Institute, Sloan-Kettering Institute, Research Triangle Institute, Mayo Foundation, National Academy of Sciences, and Franklin Institute.
- Among Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, the top five were: Aerospace Corporation, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Mitre Corporation, Project Air Force (formerly associated with the Rand Corp.) and the Institute for Defense Analysis.

(Single copies of the report, NSF 80-312, are available without charge from: National Science Foundation, 1800 G St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20550.)

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

9999
Xerox-University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor MI 48106